

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 4, 2007. Claims 1, 4, 6-10, 13 and 15-19 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 10 and 19 are in independent form. Claims 2, 3, 5, 11, 12 and 14 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 1, 4, 6-10, 13 and 15-19 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested. The canceled claims will not be further addressed herein.

An Information Disclosure Statement is being filed concurrently herewith.

Applicant hereby affirms his election of Group 1, Claims 1-19 in response to the Examiner's Restriction Requirement.

The specification has been amended to conform the Summary of Invention section to the amended claims.

Claims 1, 4, 6-10, 13 and 15-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,168,003 (Lazano et al.).

As shown above, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 10 and 19 in terms that more clearly define what he regards as his invention. Applicant submits that these amended independent claims, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus that has multiple control programs for performing processing corresponding to printer functions. The apparatus includes: (1) a first obtaining unit configured to obtain, from a first print control module, version information on a version of the first print control module and printer type information on a

printer type supported by the first print control module; (2) a second obtaining unit configured to obtain, from a second print control module, version information on a version of the first print control module and printer type information on a printer type supported by the first print control module; (3) a recording unit configured to, if the printer type information obtained by the first and second obtaining units is identical to each other, record the version information on a newer one of the versions of the first and second control modules in correspondence with the printer type information as correspondence information; (4) a recognition unit configured to recognize printer type information on a printer type of a certain printer; (5) a selection unit configured to select the version information recorded in correspondence with the printer type information recognized by the recognition unit by referring to the correspondence information recorded by the recording unit; and (6) an execution unit configured to execute one of the first and second print control modules for the version information selected by the selection unit.

In the present invention as described in the specification,¹ it is presumed that a plurality of print control modules (printer drivers) exist, each having a plurality of versions, and each supporting a plurality of printer types. If a plurality of printer drivers exist for one printer type, the version information of one of the printer drivers with the newest version is recorded in correspondence with the printer type as correspondence information. When a certain printer is connected to the information processing apparatus, the printer type of the printer is recognized and the newest version of the printer driver is selected for the printer through the recorded correspondence information. The correspondence information is formed in advance.

^{1/} It is to be understood, of course, that the claim scope is not limited by the details of the described embodiments, which are referred to only to facilitate explanation.

Among other notable features of Claim 1 are: (1) a recording unit configured to, if the printer type information obtained by the first and second obtaining units is identical to each other, record the version information on a newer one of the versions of the first and second control modules in correspondence with the printer type information as correspondence information; (2) a selection unit configured to select the version information recorded in correspondence with the printer type information recognized by the recognition unit by referring to the correspondence information recorded by the recording unit; and (3) an execution unit configured to execute one of the first and second print control modules for the version information selected by the selection unit.

Lozano relates to a method for testing peripherals (and their drivers) of a client computer, including determining what version of operating system is running on the client computer, conducting a test of any spooler that is provided with the operating system to support the spooling of data for printer peripherals and identifying all of the various printers that have been attached to the computer. The user selects which of the identified printers are to be tested and, optionally, to have their drivers replaced or updated. Lozano discusses that the selected printers are tested and the test results, including any problems with the printer driver, are provided to the user, who is then given an option to repair or upgrade the driver. However, Applicant has found nothing in Lozano that would teach or suggest at least “a recording unit configured to, if the printer type information obtained by said first and second obtaining units is identical to each other, record the version information on a newer one of the versions of the first and second control modules in correspondence with the printer type information as

correspondence information,” “a selection unit configured to select the version information recorded in correspondence with the printer type information recognized by said recognition unit by referring to the correspondence information recorded by said recording unit” or “an execution unit configured to execute one of the first and second print control modules for the version information selected by said selection unit,” as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Lozano.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant’s opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against Claim 1.

Independent Claims 10 and 19 are method and medium claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and are believed to be patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jennifer A. Reda/
Jennifer A. Reda
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 57,840

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1626142v1